UWA Academic Promotion Process Review

Purpose

This paper sets out the Academic Promotions Review Project Steering Committee’s recommendations for a revised Academic Promotion process. These recommendations have been informed by the “Academic Promotions Process: Options for Change” document and suggestions made through the consultation process with the Academic staff.

At all stages of the review process and in making the recommendations in this paper, the Steering Committee has contemplated and expects that the implementation of any recommendations will be done so in compliance with the University’s reputation as a model institutional citizen of the community. That is, that all facets of this process will apply an inclusive approach ensuring that diversity representative of the University Community in which we work and study is present.

Background

Academic Promotion seeks to recognise achievement by academic staff for their excellent contribution to teaching, research, and overall engagement at the University as well as identifying leaders who live the University’s values and demonstrate commitment to the broader community and University strategy. Accordingly, it is also an essential tool used to guide career progression and workforce planning at the University.

Academic staff, other than those on casual appointments, are eligible to apply for Academic Promotion. They may apply every two years or as their achievements merit.

Following consultation with Academic staff in September and October 2018, a steering committee was established. The committee was tasked with overseeing the development of a revised promotions framework as well as establishing appropriate criteria for promotion.

The Academic Promotions Review Project Steering Committee are:

- Professor Simon Biggs, Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor;
- Professor Robyn Owens, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research);
- Professor David Sadler, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education);
- Professor Tony O’Donnell, Executive Dean, Faculty of Science;
- Mr Nigel Waugh, Director, Human Resources;
- Ms Belinda Hammond, Manager Remuneration, Human Resources; and
- Ms Kamal Bhabra, Executive Officer.

Overview

The key areas for change recommended by the Steering Committee are as follows:

(a) Annualise the promotions process to create transparency, consistency and efficiency.
(b) Implement a user-friendly online system to receive applications.
(c) Reduce application requirements to make the process more accessible.
(d) Redefine the scope and purpose of the Head of School reports.
(e) Demarcate the promotion process for different levels of promotion. That is, distinguish between applications for promotion to Levels B, C and D, (to be considered and decided by the Faculty Promotions Committees), and applications for promotion to Level E (to be considered and decided by a University Promotions Committee).
(f) To ensure consistency, retain an overall review of promotions by the University Promotions Committee.
(g) Redefine the assessment process, including by reducing the number of Assessors required and the requirements placed on them.

(h) Set processing standards for assessment of applications, (recommended between 4 - 6 months from the submission of application to promotion outcome).

(i) Emphasise the leadership qualities necessary for senior academic staff.

The revised Academic Promotion Application process would be online and follows the following steps:

![Promotion Application Plan Diagram]

**Recommendations**

Broadly, the key areas for change set out above can be summarised into recommendations to the following areas of Academic Promotion:

1. Frequency of the Promotions Process.
2. Role of the Academic Promotions Committee (APC) and Assessors and Reports.
3. Structure and content of promotion criteria.
4. The Application.
5. Senior Academic Leadership.

### 1. Frequency of Promotions Process

**Recommendation: Annualise the Academic Promotion Process and set a 4-6 month processing standard for all applications**

To improve transparency, consistency and efficiency, applications for all levels of promotion would be accepted annually at the same time. It is proposed that the timing would be scheduled to follow the Staff Appraisal process, given that discussions regarding promotion should normally occur during that process.

This would also give the Heads of School better scope to assess promotion prospects across their portfolios because such discussions should be documented in the Staff Appraisal process, with Heads of School providing mentoring and development support.

Option for Fast Track “Out of Cycle” promotions would remain in place with strict eligibility criteria.
At the same time the University would set a standard for processing applications, with a proposed timeline of 4-6 months from application to decision.

The Steering Group recognises that such a change has the potential to disadvantage some current or 2019 prospective applicants. To mitigate that risk, we recommend that there be a transition period during which applications in progress at the time the new process is adopted would continue to be decided under the current promotions process. Further, employees would be given notice as to when the last applications will be received under the current process.

As part of the implementation of this new annual process, training and information sessions would be held and online content made available regarding the new process, application and criteria.

For completeness, we note that an appeals process would be available to applicants based on procedural errors, however, no appeals will be accepted which challenge the merit of the decision itself.

### 2. Role of the APC, Assessors and Reports

**Recommendation: Creation of new Committees**

It is proposed that there be two new committees to implement the new Academic Promotion process, with the committees each formally meeting once a year.

**Faculty Promotions Committee**

Firstly, we would create a Faculty Promotions Committee to provide greater domain expertise locally on applications and associated decisions

Committees in each Faculty would include the relevant Executive Dean and an Executive Dean from another Faculty, Associate Deans and Heads of School from the Faculty and Academic Board representatives.

Faculty Promotions Committees would assess and decide on applications for promotions to Level B, Level C and Level D.

Given the Executive Dean’s involvement in this committee as its Chairperson, it would also have the added effect of removing the need for an Executive Dean report and therefore reduce an administrative burden.

**University Promotions Committee**

Secondly, we would disband the current APC and create a new University Promotions Committee.

Membership of the University Promotions Committee would include the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Academic Board representatives and members nominated by the Vice-Chancellor.

The University Promotions Committee would assess and decide on applications for promotions to Level E. The University Promotions Committee would also review the overall outcomes of decisions made on promotions to other Levels made by Faculty Promotions Committees and have a right to request reassessment of a Faculty Promotions Committee’s decision.

**Recommendation: Reduction of number of Assessors and creation of user friendly online assessment tool**

It is proposed that the number of external assessors required be reduced and that the number required would depend on the promotion level being sought. Noting that both the Faculty and University level committees would have the discretion to ask for Assessor reports in addition to those formally required. This may be determined on a case by case basis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion Level</th>
<th>Minimum number of required Assessors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels B &amp; C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level E</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, a user-friendly online assessment tool would be provided to the nominated assessors, with a set of questions based on the promotion being sought and the assessor’s role in the decision. This online tool would also be used to achieve the assessment standard (set out above) by setting a time frame for the assessment and including automatic reminders for the assessors. This should improve participation rates, turnaround times and reduce administrative burden.

**Recommendation: Redefine the Head of School Reports and create an online workflow system**

The Steering Committee recommends that the Head of School report comprise a defined set of questions for the Head of School. The purpose of these questions would be to verify factual claims and make comment. By standardising these reports it would allow the University to ensure greater consistency and transparency across disciplines and Faculties.

Further, like the assessor reports, these would be managed via an online system where a workflow would be automatically generated and sent to the Head of School when the application has been received.

### 3. Structure and Content of Promotion Criteria

**Recommendation: Creation of a new promotion criteria with multiple career pathways to support Academic staff and a diverse workplace**

Each folio or career path would have a revised set of criteria focusing on impact, influence and engagement regardless of pathway. That said, of particular importance, is that the structure would include a clear Teaching Intensive pathway. The three proposed career pathways are as follows:

- Teaching Intensive.
- Research Intensive.
- Teaching & Research.

Refer to Appendix A for more detailed information.

### 4. The Application

**Recommendation: Reduce the application length and redesign the application to ensure a definitive focus by applicants on the quality and impact of their individual contribution**

It is proposed that applications in the new system would be limited to approximately 5 pages (plus an additional 5 pages of evidence, where needed). Previous applications have included up to 40 pages of material. Such a significant reduction would not only enable applicants to focus their applications on the revised essential criteria (set out below), but it would also reduce the administrative burden on the committees and assist in achieving the new processing standards.

Applications for promotion would be submitted on a new user-friendly online application system. This system would:

(a) auto populate some relevant employee details from the payroll system;
(b) guide applicants through the application requirements;
(c) provide specific questions to be answered; and
(d) detail the required evidence needed to support the application.
As far as is possible, evidence would be provided within the body of the application to substantiate claims of quality and impact of contributions made, rather than attaching volumes of material. The online application system would also manage word/page limits, standard fonts, workflows and automated follow up emails.

**Application Requirements**

The Steering Committee proposes that the application focuses on three defined requirements.

1. **Individual Information Summary**
   
   This summary would replace the current CV and should be two pages (with a word count not exceeding 1000 words).
   
   The Individual Information Summary is a snapshot of the applicant’s academic career. It would focus on the applicant’s employment history over the last 5 years, significant awards, grants and key activities since last promotion or commencement at UWA.

2. **Equity Consideration (Relative to Opportunity)**
   
   This portion of the application should be one page (with a word count not exceeding 250 words).
   
   This section allows presentation of any factors that may have affected the applicant’s career profile, and volume of output that they provide, in the assessment of the application.

3. **Case for Promotion**
   
   This section would be the basis of the application (with a word count not exceeding 1200 words).
   
   The Case for Promotion should be a brief and impactful narrative on the reasons for the application, with a particular focus on the applicant’s key achievements since their last promotion or appointment. It is particularly important that the applicant provide evidence to verify claims made and to explain what made the contribution distinctive, impactful and in line with the University’s vision rather than simply listing outcomes (e.g. publications and grants).

Supplementary evidence would be allowed to be included up to a maximum of five pages. Such evidence may include any relevant supporting documents to support the Impact Statement that are not readily available online.

Refer to **Appendix B, C & D** for more detailed information.

**5. Senior Academic Leadership**

**Recommendation:** a new process to finalise an academic staff member’s transition to level E that provides the individual with a defined area of practice and sets out their planned contribution to the continuing betterment of the University.

It is proposed that following a completed assessment by the University Promotions Committee those individuals who are deemed suitable for promotion to Level E should then undertake an interview with the UPC.

Prior to the interview an individual would be required to provide the following:

(a) A written 5 year plan which documents how the individual’s work would continue to align to the University’s values and strategic plan, what outcomes they hope to achieve in the coming 5 years and how they would sustain their overall contribution to the University.

(b) A defined area of practice that they would profess to, including a short statement of support not more than one page as to why this area is appropriate.

At the interview an individual would be required to speak to the above documents and expand on their vision for their role at the University going forward.
### Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Approval</td>
<td>Approvals to changes of the process, criteria and application</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consultation</td>
<td>Consultation of new process, criteria and application</td>
<td>June – July 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Part Implementation | • Current APC committee to decide on Level B & C for new applications  
• Assessors only for Level D & E for new applications  
• Updated HoS, Dean and Assessors reports  
• Level E Interviews | Sept – Oct 2019 |
| 4. Implementation | • New IT System sourced and implemented  
• Update policies and procedures  
• Information Sessions scheduled for early 2020 | July – February 2020 |
| 5. Transition | • Communicate to employees when date of last applications close under current process.  
*Applications close 18 November 2019 for the 3 December APC Meeting.*  
• APC Committee continue until all submitted applications are finalised. No new applications will be received during this time. | September 2019  
Dec 2019 – June 2020 |
| 6. Go Live | • First applications are submitted online against new process  
• Faculty & University Promotions committees decide on applications | June – Nov 2020 |
| 7. Promotions completed for 2020 | Applicants notified of outcome | December 2020 |
## Appendix A: Academic Expectations for Promotion

Eligibility and outcomes for promotion are determined on the basis of evidence that supports the quality and impact of an applicant’s demonstrated achievements. It should include collegial and collaborative behaviours/leadership balanced across the areas of research, teaching and engagement, as relevant, to benefit UWA and the wider community.

### Education – Teaching Intensive / Teaching & Research pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level B - Lecturer or equivalent</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Indicative measures</th>
<th>Impactful outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Requirements                     | At the level of Lecturer, the University is looking for a growing record of achievement in education with evidence of a positive impact on student satisfaction. Contributions to the design of units and curricula as well as the development of effective teaching materials and assessment activities are expected. Professional development activities to improve skills and the quality of education outcomes is required. They can also demonstrate effective mentoring of demonstrators and tutors, where relevant, and a willingness to work with others. A case must provide clear evidence of active support for the University’s education strategies. | The presentation of evidence should take account of the following guidelines:  
- The evidence must demonstrate excellence or least competence as stated by the applicant.  
- The evidence should be selective and focus on the impact of key achievements.  
- Evidence of impact should be verifiable such as by reference to the PSF that is illustrated in Appendix C and preferably through a peer review process. | Examples include the following:  
- Demonstrated high quality teaching.  
- Development of high quality teaching materials, including through teaching technologies.  
- Evidence of positive impact on student satisfaction.  
- Evidence of impact in curriculum development and assessment.  
- Effective design and delivery of learning activities for units / programs of study.  
- Development of units for micro-credentials.  
- Effective design and delivery of assessment that is outcomes based.  
- Effective engagement with professional development activities in learning and teaching.  
- Demonstrated capability to improve teaching outcomes. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level C - Senior Lecturer or equivalent</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>At the level of Senior Lecturer, the University is looking for a growing track record of excellence in education. Evidence of positive outcomes for students including contributions to employability are expected. Contributions to the development of engaging high-quality teaching materials is required along with unit coordination and leadership. They will engage with peer review to build stronger education outcomes and will actively participate in L&amp;T committees at school or department level. They can also demonstrate effective mentoring of demonstrators and tutors,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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where relevant, and a willingness to work with others. They are an aspirational leader.
A case must provide clear evidence of active support for the University’s education strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative measures</th>
<th>The presentation of evidence should take account of the following guidelines:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The evidence must demonstrate excellence or least competence as stated by the applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The evidence should be selective and focus on the impact of major achievements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of impact should be verifiable such as by reference to the PSF that is illustrated in Appendix C and preferably through a peer review process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impactful outcomes</th>
<th>Examples include the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective participation in a relevant UWA Community of Practice, teaching grant, or equivalent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of positive impact on student outcomes, including employability, skills development, work integrated learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of research-led teaching with positive evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of effective and high quality unit coordination and administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engagement in curriculum development and assessment design at the major or course level, or in an innovative micro-credentialing suite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrated engagement with peer review that improves teaching outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publication in Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective teamwork at department, school or faculty level to deliver L&amp;T professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Track record of engagement in peer review for the benefit of other members of staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Active and impactful participation in L&amp;T committees at department or school level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level D – Associate Professor or equivalent**

| Requirements | At the level of Associate Professor, the University is looking for sustained excellence in education. A record of successful leadership in some aspect of education is required. Leadership in the development of innovative teaching approaches, materials and/or units or courses is expected. They will engage with peer review to build stronger education outcomes and will actively participate in L&T committees at school or department level. They can also demonstrate effective mentoring of junior colleagues, demonstrators and tutors, where relevant, and a willingness to work with others. They are an established and successful leader. A case must provide clear evidence of active support for the University’s education strategies. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative measures</th>
<th>The presentation of evidence should take account of the following guidelines:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The evidence must demonstrate excellence as stated by the applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The evidence should be selective and focus on the sustained quality as evidenced through the impact of major achievements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of impact should be verifiable such as by way of reference to the PSF that is illustrated in Appendix C and preferably through a peer review process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impactful outcomes

Examples include the following:

- Internal recognition of teaching, for instance student teaching award.
- Leadership of a relevant UWA Community of Practice, teaching grant, or equivalent.
- Evidence of leadership of significant innovation in teaching (curricula, short courses, and/or pedagogy).
- Peer recognition through internal and external (national) awards and grants for teaching.
- Evidence of significant and sustained positive impact of major / course / professional development level design.
- Sustained and successful record of innovative use of technology in assessment.
- Completion of formal qualifications, e.g. Grad Cert in Tertiary Teaching.
- Invitations to speak at subject, national or international conferences.
- Leadership in the provision of L&T professional development in department, school / faculty.
- Creation of nationally recognised L&T resources, e.g. textbooks, online or multimedia materials.
- Demonstrated engagement and innovation in inclusive teaching practices to extend equality of opportunity for all learners.
- Record of effective and innovative leadership of teaching teams.
- Successful track record of mentoring other staff, leading to demonstrated improvement in outcomes.

### Level E - Professor or equivalent

#### Requirements

At the level of Professor, the University is looking for sustained excellence and innovation in education. A record of successful leadership in some aspect of education is required. Leadership in course of curriculum design and in the development of innovative teaching approaches, materials and/or units or courses is expected. They will engage with peer review to build stronger education outcomes and will actively participate in L&T committees at school or department level. They can also demonstrate effective mentoring of junior colleagues, demonstrators and tutors, where relevant, and a willingness to work with others. They are an established and successful leader.

A case must provide clear evidence of active support for the University’s education strategies.

#### Indicative measures

The presentation of evidence should take account of the following guidelines:

- The evidence must demonstrate excellence as stated by the applicant.
- The evidence should be selective and focus on the sustained quality as evidenced through the impact of major achievements.
- Evidence of impact should be verifiable such as by way of reference to the PSF that is illustrated in Appendix C and preferably through a peer review process.

#### Impactful outcomes

Examples include the following:

- Internal recognition of teaching, for instance student teaching award.
- Leadership of a relevant UWA Community of Practice, teaching grant, or equivalent.
- Evidence of leadership of significant innovation in teaching across discipline boundaries (curricula, short courses, and/or pedagogy).
Research – Research Intensive / Teaching & Research pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level B - Lecturer or equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the level of Lecturer, the University is looking for a growing track record in research and the building of a reputation through development of coherent original research work. The quality and impact of their research achievements may be exhibited through refereed publications, industry/government reports, creative works, or other scholarly activities. They can demonstrate supervision or co-supervision of Honours/Master/Higher Degree by Research (HDR) students and a willingness to undertake research with others. A case must provide clear evidence of active support for the University’s research strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Indicative measures** |
| The presentation of evidence should take account of the following guidelines: |
| • The evidence must demonstrate excellence or least competence as stated by the applicant. |
| • The evidence should be selective and focus on the impact of key achievements. |
| • The evidence of impact should be verifiable and may consist of outcomes from research-based links with industry, government, professional bodies, and charities. |
| • Evidence should preferably include a peer review process. |

| **Impactful outcomes** |
| Examples include the following: |
| • Strong citation rates for scholarly publications in peer reviewed journals. |
| • Invitations or acceptances to present at national conferences. |
| • Media coverage of research or teaching (including social media activity). |
| • Funding success to support research either as part of a team or individually. |
## Level C - Senior Lecturer or equivalent

### Requirements
At the level of Senior Lecturer, the University is looking for a well-established track record in research. A national reputation is essential and will be achieved through development of coherent original research work and a clear record of impact in their field of expertise. The quality of significant research achievements will be demonstrated from the impact of high quality refereed publications, creative works, or other scholarly activities. They can demonstrate quality supervision of Honours/Master/Higher Degree by Research (HDR) students including successful completions and co-publishing. They are an aspirational leader.

A case must provide clear evidence of active support for the University’s research strategies.

### Indicative measures
The presentation of evidence should take account of the following guidelines:
- The evidence must demonstrate excellence or least competence as stated by the applicant.
- The evidence should be selective and focus on the impact of major achievements.
- Evidence for impact should be verifiable and may arise from research-based links with industry, government, professional and other funding bodies.
- Evidence should preferably include a peer review process.

### Impactful outcomes
Examples include the following:
- Evidence of sustained growth in citations for research publications.
- Independent published reviews of scholarly or performance works.
- Funding success to support research from competitive grant sources.
- Invitations to present at national conferences.
- Nationally recognised awards and prizes.
- Emerging capacity to build sustainable and collaborative research partnerships with other organisations.
- Impact of consultancy work or contract research for the partner, and/or evidence of repeat funding.
- Emerging evidence of successful mentoring of junior staff and/or research students.
- Active engagement to the Faculty/School and University, with appropriate evidence of leadership, (e.g.: Contribution to University or Faculty Committee or University policy).

## Level D – Associate Professor or equivalent

### Requirements
At the level of Associate Professor, the University is looking for sustained excellence in research performance. An excellent national reputation with increasing international standing achieved through leadership of coherent original research work and a clear record of impact in their field of expertise. The quality of significant research achievements will be demonstrated from the impact of high quality refereed publications, creative works, or other scholarly activities. They can demonstrate quality supervision of Honours/Master/Higher Degree by Research (HDR) students including successful completions and co-publishing. They are an aspirational leader.

A case must provide clear evidence of active support for the University’s research strategies.

### Indicative measures
The presentation of evidence should take account of the following guidelines:
- The evidence must demonstrate excellence or least competence as stated by the applicant.
- The evidence should be selective and focus on the impact of major achievements.
- Evidence for impact should be verifiable and may arise from research-based links with industry, government, professional and other funding bodies.
- Evidence should preferably include a peer review process.

### Impactful outcomes
Examples include the following:
- Evidence of sustained growth in citations for research publications.
- Independent published reviews of scholarly or performance works.
- Funding success to support research from competitive grant sources.
- Invitations to present at national conferences.
- Nationally recognised awards and prizes.
- Emerging capacity to build sustainable and collaborative research partnerships with other organisations.
- Impact of consultancy work or contract research for the partner, and/or evidence of repeat funding.
- Emerging evidence of successful mentoring of junior staff and/or research students.
- Active engagement to the Faculty/School and University, with appropriate evidence of leadership, (e.g.: Contribution to University or Faculty Committee or University policy).
research work and a clear record of impact and innovation in their field of expertise. The high quality and impact of their sustained, substantial and significant research achievements may be demonstrated high quality refereed publications, creative works, or other scholarly activities. They can demonstrate sustained track record of successful supervision of Honours/Masters/Higher Degree by Research (HDR) students, mentoring of junior colleagues and are an emerging leader.

A case must provide clear evidence of active support for the University’s research strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative measures</th>
<th>The presentation of evidence should take account of the following guidelines:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The evidence must demonstrate excellence as stated by the applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The evidence should be selective and focus on the sustained quality as evidenced through the impact of major achievements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of impact should be verifiable and may arise from research-based links with industry, government, professional and other funding bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence should preferably include a peer review process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impactful outcomes</th>
<th>Examples include the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of significant sustained citations for key research publications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of the impact of key publications either on academic practice, policy or practice in business, government or broader society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Independent published reviews of scholarly or performance works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustained funding success to support research from competitive grant sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Invitations to present at major international conferences in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Invitations to curate international exhibitions in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Significant national or International awards and prizes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Successfully mentoring junior staff career advancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrated capacity to build sustainable research partnerships with other organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Significant impact of consultancy work or contract research for the partner, and/or evidence of repeat funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-leading media or community events engagement with industry advisory boards).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Successful supervision of HDR students with evidence of timely completions and co-publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Active engagement to the Faculty/School and University, with appropriate evidence of leadership, (eg: Contribution to University or Faculty Committee or University policy).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level E - Professor or equivalent**

| Requirements | At the level of Professor, the University is looking for a demonstration of research leadership at an international level and a sustained record of high quality outcomes based on a national or international research program. The high quality and impact of their sustained, substantial and significant research achievements may be demonstrated high quality refereed publications, creative works, or other scholarly activities. Impact of the research may also be demonstrated through outcomes such as national and international government policy changes and leading public debate or with impact on industry, including the translation of research results for economic, societal, cultural or environmental benefit. They will have a distinguished and verifiable international reputation and be a successful leader and mentor. |
A case must provide clear evidence of active support for the University’s research strategies.

### Indicative measures

The presentation of evidence should take account of the following guidelines:

- The evidence must demonstrate excellence as stated by the applicant.
- The evidence should be selective and focus on the sustained quality as evidenced through the impact of major achievements.
- Evidence of impact should be verifiable and may arise from research-based links with industry, government, professional and other funding bodies.
- Evidence should preferably include a peer review process.

### Impactful outcomes

Examples include the following:

- Evidence of significant sustained citations for key research publications.
- Evidence of the significant impact of key publications either on academic practice, policy or practice in business, government or broader society.
- Independent published reviews of scholarly or performance works.
- Sustained major funding success to support research from competitive grant sources, industry government, charities and/or philanthropic sources.
- Invitations to present at major international conferences in the field and/or to be lead organiser of major conference.
- Invitations to curate international exhibitions in the field.
- Significant national or internationally awards and prizes.
- Successfully mentoring junior staff career advancement.
- Demonstrated success in building major sustainable research partnerships with other organisations.
- Significant impact of consultancy work or contract research for the partner, and/or evidence of sustained repeat funding.
- Leading media or community events.
- Excellent research environment that promotes successful and on-time completion of HDR students; Evidence for successful development of independent research students.
- Demonstrated capacity to build major collaborative research partnerships.
- Leadership of social impact activities that span disciplines (TedX, Research Impact series).
- Leadership to the Faculty/School and University, with appropriate evidence of leadership, (e.g. Leadership of University or Faculty Committee or University policy).

---

**Engagement – Teaching Intensive / Research Intensive / Teaching & Research pathways**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level B - Lecturer or equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the level of Lecturer, the University is looking for a demonstration of participation in education/research leadership in public engagements, government and industry. The applicant would show evidence of involvement in consultation with external sectors and be experienced with public lecturing. All members of the academic staff are expected to participate in the universities social impact studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The presentation of evidence should take account of the following guidelines:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of the application and translation of research outcomes into society and/or industry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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- Evidence should focus on verifiable impact of activities.

**Impactful outcomes**

Examples include the following:
- Contributed to public engagement activities that promote research and/or education outcomes.
- Given public lectures.
- Independently or jointly developed patentable outcomes, evidenced by provisional patents.
- Undertaking regular consultancy activity for government, industry or charity sectors.
- Developing informative and accessible media based on research or education outcomes.
- Outreach activities for the university (schools liaison, open days etc).
- Regular participation in formal networks that facilitate the exchange of ideas on a regular basis.

---

**Level C - Senior Lecturer or equivalent**

**Requirements**

At the level of Senior Lecturer, the University is looking for a demonstration of participation in education/research leadership in public engagements, government and industry. The applicant would show evidence of involvement in an innovation beyond academia. Commercial management exposure dealing with contractual and public engagement of the innovation to the wider community is required. All members of the academic staff are expected to participate in the universities social impact studies.

**Indicative measures**

The presentation of evidence should take account of the following guidelines:
- Evidence of the application and translation of research outcomes into society and/or industry.
- Evidence should focus on verifiable impact of activities.

**Impactful outcomes**

Examples include the following:
- Leading on public engagement activities that promote research and/or education outcomes.
- Given regular lectures or series of lectures to the public.
- Independently or jointly developed patentable outcomes, evidenced by provisional patents.
- Participated in the commercialisation of research or education outcomes; licensing of IP, formation of spin-out etc.
- Undertaking regular consultancy activity for government, industry or charity sectors with evidence for impact of this work through alterations to public policy, new industrial processes etc.
- Participation in major contract research partnerships with industry, government or other funding agencies.
- Developing informative and accessible media based on research or education outcomes.
- Outreach activities for the university (schools liaison, open days etc).
- Leading role in formal networks that facilitate the exchange of ideas on a regular basis.
- Participation in social impact activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>At the level of Associate Professor, the University is looking for a demonstration of education/research leadership in public engagements, government and industry. The applicant would show a legacy of being a leading contributor to innovation beyond academia. Commercial management experience dealing with contractual and public engagement of the innovation to the wider community is required. All members of the academic staff are expected to participate in the universities social impact studies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative measures</td>
<td>The presentation of evidence should take account of the following guidelines:                                                                                              • Evidence of the application and translation of research outcomes into society and/or industry.                                                                                              • Evidence should focus on verifiable impact of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impactful outcomes</td>
<td>Examples include the following:                                                                                      • Leading role in public engagement activities that promote research and/or education outcomes.                                                                                     • Given regular lectures or series of lectures to the public.                                                                                     • Invitations to present research or education outcomes to government or industry.                                                                 • Led a significant strategic innovation, facilitating effective knowledge transfer beyond academia.                                                                 • Independently or jointly developed patentable outcomes, evidenced by provisional or granted patents.                                                                 • Leading role in the commercialisation of research or education outcomes; licensing of IP, formation of spin-out etc.                                                                 • Sustained consultancy activity for government, industry or charity sectors with evidence for impact of this work through alterations to public policy, new industrial processes etc.                                                                 • Leading role in major contract research partnerships with industry, government or other funding agencies.                                                                 • Developing informative and accessible media based on research or education outcomes.                                                                 • Outreach activities for the university (schools liaison, open days etc).                                                                 • Leading role in formal networks that facilitate the exchange of ideas on a regular basis.                                                                 • Participation in social impact activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level E - Professor or equivalent</td>
<td>At the level of Professor, the University is looking for a demonstration of significant education/research leadership in public engagements, government and industry. The high impact of their engagement should be demonstrated through formation of leading partnerships with both public and private funding groups. A major facet of a Level E position is in leadership that expands on building the university's reputation on research and education outcomes by networking and other media activities. All members of the academic staff are expected to participate in the universities social impact studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative measures</td>
<td>The presentation of evidence should take account of the following guidelines:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of the application and translation of research outcomes into society and/or industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence should focus on verifiable impact of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impactful outcomes</td>
<td>Examples include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leading role in public engagement activities that promote research and/or education outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Led the development of significant public engagement activities to promote the intellectual work of the university to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Invitations to present research or education outcomes to government or industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Led significant strategic innovations, facilitating effective knowledge transfer beyond academia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Independently or jointly developed patentable outcomes, evidenced by provisional or granted patents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leading role in the commercialisation of research or education outcomes; licensing of IP, formation of spin-out etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustained consultancy activity for government, industry or charity sectors with evidence for the significant impact of this work. through alterations to public policy, new industrial processes etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formation of, and leadership to, major and/or consortia. partnerships with industry, government or other funding agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership on the development of informative and accessible media based on research or education outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Playing a major role in the design and delivery of significant outreach activities for the university (schools liaison, open days etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Foundational role in building formal networks that facilitate the significant exchange of ideas on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership in social impact activities that build the reputation of the university’s research and education outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Examples of Research Achievements

Below are some general examples of contributions in Research.

### Discipline achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of achievement</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Undertaking Quality Research      | • Meeting or exceeding Faculty research output targets, normalised to relevant discipline  
• Evidence of academic impact (e.g., category normalised citation impact or other)  
• Positive reviews of books and book chapters  
• Positive media mentions of research  
• Evidence of open access to research outputs and research data where appropriate |
| Achievements of Students           | • High quality publications of existing HDR students  
• Prestigious employment of former HDR students  
• Prizes won by HDR students |
| Successful Leadership of Teams     | • High quality team publications  
• Increase in research funding, awards and prizes  
• Increase in number of HDR applicants  
• Positive media mentions of team research  
• Success and recognition/prizes of ECRs in the team  
• Evidence of mentoring leading to career advancement of team members |
| Editorial Work                     | • Improvements in number of submissions, ranking of journal |
| Conference Management              | • Positive feedback from attendees  
• Increase in number of paper submissions and attendees |

### Building a reputation of research excellence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of achievement</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Income                          | • Cat 1 income meeting or exceeding Faculty targets  
• Achievement of fellowships  
• Cat 2,3,4 income meeting or exceeding Faculty targets |
| Esteem measures                 | • Invitations to referee or review for competitive grant scheme and high quality journals  
• Visiting scholar, plenary speaker invitations  
• Requests to examine theses and participate on thesis panels  
• Involvement in collaborations with other universities and organisations  
• Election to a learned academy  
• Prizes and awards for research excellence |
| Quality Supervision and Mentoring| HDR – Higher Degree by Research students  
• Meeting or exceeding Faculty expectations for completions or load  
• Supervision awards  
• Achievements of former students (as above) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improved research performance of staff due to mentoring (high quality publications of those staff, prestigious employment, prizes won, careers developed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership of Teams and research units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Examples of Education Achievements

The proposed framework seeks to reward promotion around four key domains that align with the University’s Education Plan. Those four domains are:

1. Learning, Teaching and Student Outcomes;
2. Curriculum Design and Assessment;
3. Reflection, Scholarship and Continuing Professional Development; and
4. Leadership and Service.

These four key domains are expressly aligned to the Higher Education Academy’s Professional Standards Framework (PSF), to facilitate the process of writing an application for promotion and reduce duplication of effort from writing the applications for Fellowships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Learning, Teaching and Student Outcomes</th>
<th>Curriculum Design and Assessment</th>
<th>Reflection, Scholarship and Continuing Professional Development</th>
<th>Leadership and Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Design and plan learning activities and/or programmes of study</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Teach and/or support learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Assess and give feedback to learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Develop effective learning environments and approaches to student support and guidance</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Engage in continuing professional development in subjects/disciplines and their pedagogy, incorporating research, scholarship and the evaluation of professional practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>The subject material</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>Appropriate methods for teaching, learning and assessing in the subject area and at the level of the academic programme</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3</td>
<td>How students learn, both generally and within their subject / disciplinary area(s)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K4</td>
<td>The use and value of appropriate learning technologies</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K5</td>
<td>Methods for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K6</td>
<td>The implications of quality assurance and quality enhancement for academic and professional practice with a particular focus on teaching</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>Respect individual learners and diverse learning communities</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>Promote participation in higher education and equality of opportunity for learners</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>Use evidence-informed approaches and the outcomes from research, scholarship and continuing professional development</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>Acknowledge the wider context in which higher education operates recognising the implications for professional practice</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Application

Detailed information on the revised application format and requirements are set out below

Individual Information Summary (CV)

The Individual Information Summary is a snapshot of the applicant's academic career, which will change as their circumstances alter.

A standard summary includes:

(a) person details, (auto populated where possible based on the Employee ID);
(b) qualifications;
(c) employment history, (for last 5 years only);
(d) relevant Awards, prizes, grants since last promotion or commencement date at UWA;
(e) publications or other scholarly outcomes, (with a focus on impact and contribution)*; and
(f) self-nomination of two assessors, (Level D & E only).

*Noting that the format for item (e) is required to be 100 words per publication justification, (excluding Outcome Type, Title and Authors):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Self-nomination of Assessors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level B Applicants</td>
<td>Top 2 and why they have been chosen – Level of publication or contribution, evidence of impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C Applicants</td>
<td>Top 5 and why they have been chosen – Level of publication or contribution, evidence of impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D &amp; E Applicants</td>
<td>Top 10 and why they have been chosen – international impact and level of publication or contribution, evidence of impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equity Consideration (Relative to Opportunity)

This section is to consider if any factors have affected the applicant's career profile and volume (but not quality) of outputs. To be considered in the assessment of the application and not to exceed 250 words.

These factors may include, but are not limited to personal, or other non-academic circumstances that have restricted or delayed the applicant's professional career, and other work related delays caused by secondments / projects with private industry.

Case for Promotion (Impact Statement and Evidence Appendix)

The Case for Promotion is intended to be a brief and impactful narrative on the reasons for the application and with a particular focus on the achievements since the last promotion. It should not exceed more than 1200 words, although may include an evidence appendix of up to five pages.

It is particularly important that the applicant provide examples and explain what made their contribution distinctive, impactful and in line with the University's vision rather than simply listing achievements (e.g. publications and grants).

The fundamentals of the case for promotion will be dependent upon the applicant's chosen career pathway and will relate to research, teaching, service and engagement. The balance between these components will depend upon each individual's specific circumstances as well as where they are able to best show verifiable and impactful outcomes. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure an appropriate balance is reached that allows the committee to have confidence that they are working successfully at the correct level across all areas relevant to their role and in accordance with their chosen career pathway.
**Impact Statement**

The statement should address the following factors:

**Significance**

Outline the specific grounds on which the application is based. Clearly state the main focus of the work and the particular achievements that are claimed, together with a brief overview of the significance of their contribution in the wider context of the discipline and the University.

**Workload**

Indicate the proportion of a full-time work load they have spent over the last five years in each of the relevant categories:

(a) Research intensive;
(b) Teaching intensive; or
(c) Teaching and Research.

**Opportunities**

Outline the research, teaching and service, opportunities that they have had in the context of their employment situation, including the research and/or teaching mentoring and research and/or teaching facilities available to them. For example:

(a) teaching / service opportunities in the school;
(b) research support; or
(c) location and timing of opportunities.

**Other**

Consider stating any other aspects of their career or opportunities for achievement that are relevant to the assessment and that have not been detailed elsewhere in this Impact Statement.

**Evidence Appendix**

The appendix should include any relevant supporting documents to back up the Impact Statement. The type of documents may include but are not limited to the following:

- Industry letter on successful collaborative work based on the applicant’s involvement.
- Media statement on project or research outcome.
- Recognition from professional boards or entities.
- Student feedback.
- Peer review of teaching.
- Relevant UWA leader’s recognition of engagement at the University.

**Assessors and Assessor’s Report**

The number of assessors is based on the promotion level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion Level</th>
<th>Assessors required</th>
<th>Type of Assessor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application for promotion to Level B</td>
<td>0 assessors required</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for promotion to Level C</td>
<td>0 assessors required</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Application for promotion to Level D     | 3 assessors        | 1 x International  
1 x G08  
1 x Teaching (if applicable) |
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Subject to approval by the University, the nominated assessors will automatically receive a request for the application assessment. Once they agree to act as assessor, they will have instant access to complete the report online and reminders will automatically be sent to the assessor in the given timeline to submit their report.

The report includes set questions on the following points (as applicable to the applicant’s chosen career pathway):

**Research**

(a) Highlight any evidence of the candidate’s prominence in their subject, particularly in terms of the quality and originality of their research.

(b) Outline what they consider the impact of the candidate’s work has been within their discipline.

(c) Comment on whether they consider there to be an upward trajectory and forward-looking agenda (e.g. not just a history of research output).

(d) In reference to the University of Western Australia’s promotion criteria, please confirm whether the case meets the standards for promotion.

(e) Comment on how the case compares with recent successful cases for promotion to the equivalent level within their institution.

(f) Provide evidence that the case does not meet the relevant requirements at this point, any advice they are able to offer on the timing and strategy as to when or how this might be achieved.

**Teaching**

(a) Provide evidence of the candidate’s contribution to education and pedagogy, particularly in terms of their scholarly activity and research and/or innovation.

(b) Evidence of leadership in developing the education strategy of the University.

(c) Evidence of educational innovation, course design and development.

(d) Comment on the significant enhancements and impact to the student experience.

**Engagement**

(a) Provide evidence of promoting and enhancing the University’s reputation profile

(b) Evidence of contributing to knowledge transfer

(c) Comment on their successful leadership

(d) Consider the impact and evidence of the candidate’s work in relation to societal, community and business partnerships

**Head of School Report (HOS)**

The Head of School will indicate if they support the application for promotion and nominate assessors as required for each level of promotion.

The HOS Report will be an online set of questions where they will have the opportunity to briefly explain or confirm the applicant’s contributions on the following focus points:
Research
(a) Assessment of the best publications or contributions during the last five years (high quality journals A or A*).
(b) Value of grants awarded in each of the last five years indicating how grant capture levels compare to external norms (nationally competitive grants).
(c) H-index indicating how the index score compares to external norms (Faculty norms).
(d) Socratic Index- performance measure for researchers using research performance data.
(e) Citations.
(f) Number of PhD students at present and number graduated during the last five years.
(g) International impact and reputation – Level D and E.

Teaching
(a) Summary of teaching contribution (load/volume data) and how this compares to other academics in the School/Department.
(b) SPOT scores – student perceptions of teaching.
(c) SURF scores – student unit reflective feedback.
(d) Other comments on teaching, including contribution to innovation in teaching and development of new curriculum etc.

Engagement
(a) Statement on citizenship, mentoring and leadership both within and outside of UWA as evidenced through effecting positive change.
(b) Statement on Knowledge Transfer/ Business Engagement activity including policy development.
(c) Statement on Public Engagement/ Impact activity.
(d) Service to the University.
(e) Service to the community.

Faculty Promotions Committee
The Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC) will assess and decide applications for promotion to Level B, Level C and Level D.

The FPC will be comprised of at least 10 members depending on the size of the Faculty in receipt of the applications. The members will be drawn from the following positions:
- Executive Dean of the applicant Faculty (Chair).
- Executive Dean from another Faculty.
- Associate Deans.
- Heads of School.
- Academic Board representatives.

In attendance and to provide advice as needed will also be the:
- Faculty HR Business Partner; and
- Executive Officer.

Noting that the final make-up of the FPCs will be decided by Chair of the University Promotions Committee (SDVC).
University Promotions Committee

The University Promotions Committee (UPC) will assess and decide on the applications for promotion to Level E.

The UPC is comprised of 10 members who are as follows:

- Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor – appointed by the Vice-Chancellor (Chair).
- Each Faculty’s Executive Dean.
- Two members nominated by the Academic Board.
- Two members nominated by the Vice-Chancellor.
- One member appointed by the Vice-Chancellor from a list of three names submitted by the Academic Staff Association.

In attendance and to provide advice as required will also be:

- Remuneration Manager, Human Resources; and
- Executive Officer.
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